



*John T. Aubberger
Supervisor*

TOWN OF GREECE

PLANNING BOARD MINUTES

JULY 7, 2010

THE MEETING BEGAN AT 7:00 P.M.

PRESENT

Alvin I. Fisher, Jr., Chairman

Christine R. Burke

Brian E. Marianetti

Grace L. Plouffe

William E. Selke

Christopher A. Schiano, Deputy Town Attorney

Scott R. Copey, Clerk of the Planning Board

John Gauthier, P.E., Associate Engineer

Linda R. Lamb, Planning Board Secretary

ABSENT

Alfred S. Ancello

Michael H. Sofia

ADDITIONS, DELETIONS AND CONTINUANCES TO THE AGENDA

ANNOUNCEMENTS

PLANNING BOARD MINUTES
JULY 7, 2010

PUBLIC HEARINGS

New Business

None

Old Business

1. Applicant: Robert & Stacey Collins

Location: 450 Mill Road

Request: Minor subdivision approval for the Collins subdivision, consisting of 3 lots (existing house to remain on 1 lot; 2 new lots for development) on 9.5+/- acres

Zoning District: R1-44 (Single-Family Residential)

Mon. Co. Tax No.: 058.03-1-48

The following is a synopsis of the discussion pertaining to the above-referenced request:

Kris Schultz, L.S., P.E., of Schultz Associates presented the application.

Mr. Schultz: I'd like to do a quick overview of the development. This property is being subdivided from a 9.5-acre site. This property has been in Ms. Collins's family for a number of years. They currently reside in the farmhouse on the property up near the lot frontage. Their plans are to subdivide the lot and create a new lot surrounding the adjacent existing house and one additional building lot, with the balance of the land remaining undeveloped at this time. The purpose of this is to build their new home. The new residence will be located just off Mill Road and will be serviced by all public utilities. The proposed construction will coincide with the scheduled Mill Road improvements, which helps with items like sanitary sewer and may expedite and save some costs. We are trying to reflect all the changes on Mill Road, new storm sewer, pavement, etc. on these plans.

Mr. Copey: The plans were reviewed by Monroe County Development Review Committee (MCDRC), which provided detailed comments. Greece Environmental Board (GEB) suggested buffer and erosion control around the existing creeks and requested that the owners work with the Town's Tree Council. Limited Town staff comments were provided but did include items such as hydrant location, addresses.

Mr. Gauthier: The main concerns were the tributary and creek crossing the property. Generally in this situation, we ask for the floodplain to be delineated. We also have the standard drainage comments relating to any subdivision. It is a minor subdivision, but if improperly developed could create a problem.

Mr. Schultz: I have no concerns with what has been discussed with Engineering. This site has not been mapped by the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA), but of course every site has a floodplain. The Town studied all Town creeks and did floodplain mapping. We are fortunate in that the owner has lived there for a number years and can provide evidence as to where it may flood in the worst events; we are well away from those areas. I want the Board to know that my clients are very interested in having a minimal impact on the property. We will keep as many trees as possible.

PLANNING BOARD MINUTES
JULY 7, 2010

Mr. Copey: One point of clarification is the proposed sidewalk along the front of Lots 1 and 2. Will the sidewalk be completed by the developer or the County as part of the Mill Road improvements?

Mr. Schultz: I believe it will be part of the Mill Road improvements. If the County builds it, we will make provisions for them to do so via easements. We have shown all the Mill Road improvements as part of the site map. If it isn't part of Mill Road requirements, the owners would comply with the Town's requirements to provide a sidewalk.

Mr. Gauthier: You could also request a sidewalk waiver from the Town Board; but the sidewalk shouldn't be dependent on timing of Mill Road improvements.

Mr. Selke: Which lot will be developed and will you have to cross the creek?

Mr. Schultz: Lot 2 will have the new house. It is a tributary and will have standard culverts to allow water to move.

Mr. Selke: Is the property on sanitary or septic?

Mr. Schultz: It is on sanitary sewers.

Motion by Mr. Selke, seconded by Ms. Burke:

WHEREAS, Robert and Stacey Collins (the "Applicant") has submitted a proposal to the Town of Greece Planning Board (the "Planning Board") for approval of a minor subdivision, as more fully described in the minutes of this public meeting (the "Proposal"), relative to property located 450 Mill Road (the "Premises"); and

WHEREAS, the Planning Board makes the following findings:

1. Upon review of the Proposal, the Planning Board determined that the Proposal is subject to the State Environmental Quality Review Act (New York State Environmental Conservation Law, Article 8) and its implementing regulations (6 NYCRR Part 617 *et seq.*, the "SEQRA Regulations") (collectively, "SEQRA"), and that the Proposal constitutes an Unlisted action under SEQRA.
2. The Planning Board has considered the Proposal at a public meeting (the "Meeting") in the Greece Town Hall, 1 Vince Tofany Boulevard, at which time all persons and organizations in interest were heard.
3. Documentary, testimonial, and other evidence were presented at the Meeting relative to the Proposal for the Planning Board's consideration.
4. The Planning Board carefully has considered an Environmental Assessment Form and supplementary information prepared by the Applicant and the Applicant's representatives, including but not limited to supplemental maps, drawings, descriptions, analyses, reports, and reviews (collectively, the "Environmental Analysis").
5. The Planning Board carefully has considered additional information and comments that resulted from telephone conversations, meetings, or written correspondence from or with the Applicant and the Applicant's representatives.
6. The Planning Board carefully has considered information, recommendations, and comments that resulted from telephone conversations, meetings, or written correspondence from or with various involved and interested agencies, including but not limited to the Monroe County Department of Planning and Development, the

PLANNING BOARD MINUTES

JULY 7, 2010

Monroe County Department of Environmental Services, the Town of Greece Environmental Board, and the Town's own staff.

7. The Planning Board carefully has considered information, recommendations, and comments that resulted from telephone conversations, meetings, or written correspondence from or with nearby property owners, and all other comments submitted to the Planning Board as of this date.
8. The Environmental Analysis examined the relevant issues associated with the Proposal.
9. The Planning Board has met the procedural and substantive requirements of SEQRA.
10. The Planning Board carefully has considered each and every criterion for determining the potential significance of the Proposal upon the environment, as set forth in SEQRA.
11. The Planning Board carefully has considered (that is, has taken the required "hard look" at) the Proposal and the relevant environmental impacts, facts, and conclusions disclosed in the Environmental Analysis.
12. The Planning Board concurs with the information and conclusions contained in the Environmental Analysis.
13. The Planning Board has made a careful, independent review of the Proposal and the Planning Board's determination is rational and supported by substantial evidence, as set forth herein.
14. To the maximum extent practicable, potential adverse environmental effects revealed in the environmental review process will be minimized or avoided by the incorporation of mitigation measures that were identified as practicable.

NOW, THEREFORE, be it

RESOLVED that, pursuant to SEQRA, based on the aforementioned information, documentation, testimony, and findings, and after examining the relevant issues, the Planning Board's own initial concerns, and all relevant issues raised and recommendations offered by involved and interested agencies and the Town's own staff, the Planning Board determines that the Proposal will not have a significant adverse impact on the environment, which constitutes a negative declaration.

VOTE:

Ancello - absent
Marianetti - yes
Selke - yes

Burke - yes
Plouffe - yes
Sofia - absent
Fisher - yes

MOTION CARRIED

SEQRA DETERMINATION

NEGATIVE DECLARATION

Mr. Selke then made the following motion, seconded by Ms. Burke, to approve the Proposal, subject to the following conditions:

1. The Applicant shall develop the Premises in conformity with all details of the Proposal as presented in the written descriptions and site development plans, as orally

PLANNING BOARD MINUTES

JULY 7, 2010

presented to the Planning Board, and as set forth herein. In the event of any conflict among the oral or written descriptions of the proposal, the site development plans of the proposal, or the requirements or restrictions of this resolution, the Applicant agrees that the Planning Board shall determine the resolution of such dispute.

2. A dated signature of the owner/developer shall be added to the plat.
3. Any Town of Greece approval or permit for these premises does not relieve the applicant, developer, or owner of the premises from obtaining all other town, county, state, or federal government approvals or permits that are required for the premises. A note that indicates this requirement shall be added to the plat.
4. A 5-foot-wide concrete sidewalk shall be constructed along the Mill Road frontage of the site. If the Town Board grants a waiver of the sidewalk requirement, the date of such waiver shall be added to the plat.
5. This subdivision section is located within the Town's Sanitary Trunk Sewer Overlay Area. A sanitary sewer entrance fee surcharge shall be required for each building lot in this subdivision, payable to the Town upon the issuance of the original building permit for each house. In addition, a limited-term annual debt repayment charge shall be applied to each house constructed in this subdivision. Such fee shall be included in the "Applicable Fees" block on the plat.
6. The Town's *2001 Community Master Plan Update* (Clough, Harbour & Associates, September 2001) contains current and projected population growth; an inventory and analysis of public, private, and semi-private recreation facilities, both active and passive; and recommendations for future actions. Based on this document, the Planning Board finds that the Town currently needs, or will need, additional park and recreation space in the vicinity of the Proposal. The Planning Board further finds that development of this subdivision will contribute to the demand for additional park and recreation space, and that this subdivision provides no suitable park or recreation land to address such current or future need. Therefore, pursuant to New York State Town Law, Section 277, payment of the Town's recreation fee shall be required for each building lot in this subdivision, payable to the Town upon the issuance of the original building permit for each house.
7. No building permits shall be issued for any of the lots in this subdivision unless and until this final plat has been recorded in the Office of the Monroe County Clerk. The Liber and Page at which this final plat is recorded in the Office of the Monroe County Clerk shall be indicated on the approved, signed copies of this final plat that are submitted to the Town. A note that indicates this requirement shall be added to the plat.
8. Drainage easements shall be provided over streams, wetlands, or flood zone areas on the site as may be directed by the Commissioner of Public Works. Such easements shall be shown on the plat, site plan, utility, and grading sheets. The final boundaries and terms of such easements shall be subject to approval by the Planning Board's Attorney, and the Commissioner of Public Works.
9. No final approval signature shall be placed on the plans unless and until the appropriate easement documents have been prepared and provided to the Town for review.
10. No building permits shall be issued for any of the lots in this subdivision unless and until the appropriate easement documents, including all necessary map references, have been filed in the Office of the Monroe County Clerk. The Liber and Page of

PLANNING BOARD MINUTES

JULY 7, 2010

easement filing shall be referenced on final as-built record drawings provided to the Town.

11. No pre-construction meeting shall be scheduled unless and until a Notice Of Intent (NOI) has been filed with the New York State Department of Environmental Conservation (the "NYSDEC").
12. No building permits shall be issued for any of the lots in this subdivision unless and until a digital copy of the plans has been submitted. All sheets in the drawing set, with all necessary signatures and the Liber and Page at which this final plat is recorded in the Office of the Monroe County Clerk, shall be provided in Tagged Image File (".TIF") format at a minimum resolution of 400 dpi.
13. Subject to approval by the Town's Chief Engineer and Commissioner of Public Works.
14. Wherever this resolution refers to a specific applicant, developer, operator, or property owner, it shall be construed to include successors and assigns.
15. Wherever this resolution refers to a specific public official or agency, it shall be construed to include successors and assigns.
16. Wherever this resolution refers to a specific law, ordinance, code, rule, or regulation, it shall be construed to include any succeeding or superseding authority.

VOTE:

Ancello - absent
Marianetti - yes
Selke - yes

Burke - yes
Plouffe - yes
Sofia - absent
Fisher - yes

MOTION CARRIED
APPLICATION APPROVED
WITH CONDITIONS

PLANNING BOARD MINUTES
JULY 7, 2010

SITE PLANS

Old Business

1. Applicant: 2390 West Ridge, LLC

Location: 2390 West Ridge Road

Request: Site plan approval for a proposed two-story commercial building (6672+/- square feet first floor, 3081+/- square feet lower level; 9937+/- square feet total) and renovation of a former church for commercial use, with related parking, utilities, grading, and landscaping on approximately 1.03 acres

Zoning District: BR (Restricted Business)

Mon. Co. Tax No.: 074.14-2-22.2

The following is a synopsis of the discussion pertaining to the above-referenced request:

Kris Schultz, L.S., P.E., of Schultz Associates presented the application with Larry Fenity, R.A., Fenity Architects

Mr. Schultz: This site has an existing, historic structure on it. The issue was to develop the site with the historic church and make it work. Our first plans were to attach, and match, the church with the new building. We ran into some issues with parking and access. It got to a point where it just wouldn't work. We have reconfigured the plans to generate a separate building to the west of the church. We have a parking count close to the zoning ordinance requirements. We eliminated some variances for setback. We still need some variances, which relate to loss of frontage along West Ridge Road because of the West Ridge Road reconstruction. We appeared before the Board of Zoning Appeals (BZA) last night and the comments were favorable, but they asked us to come back in two weeks.

Mr. Schiano: At the BZA last evening, the BZA held its decision in the event that something changed at the Planning Board's meeting this evening. The BZA had favorable comments toward granting the variances.

Mr. Fisher: Is the BZA looking for a recommendation from this Board?

Mr. Schiano: Yes, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Schultz: Pointing out a few changes, we have eliminated one of two entrances off Grecian Gardens Boulevard, which allows for more parking. Splitting out the new building from the existing church gave us more parking along the church. We still plan to change the church's entrance to the west side of that building. The New York State Department of Transportation (NYSDOT) West Ridge Road reconstruction left us with a ramped entrance off the front, which just doesn't work. An unchanged item from previous site plans is the storm sewer system. It will collect drainage that sheet flows onto the St. John the Evangelist Church parcel and end in a storm system at Grecian Gardens apartments, then flow to the east. We are going to collect it, do some sub-surface storage of it, and have been able to obtain from Grecian Gardens rights of ingress/egress and access to utilities. A copy of the filed agreement has been provided to the Planning Board. Part of that negotiation consisted of helping Grecian Gardens get their sign back. We are showing a new sign for them, located on the southwest corner of our site; variances for that sign have been obtained. Comments from St. John the Evangelist Church and Gina DiBella, Chairperson of the Town's Historic Preservation Commission, were provided last evening. You may recall from previous meetings on this site, that St. John the Evangelist Church requested that additional

PLANNING BOARD MINUTES

JULY 7, 2010

lighting flow onto their site for security reasons. This is different from what we normally hear. Our lighting plan does not contain photometrics at this time; we are awaiting input on this situation from the Board.

Mr. Fenity: When we spoke to you about this project a couple of years ago, we had a different set of problems to solve. With the new building attached to the historic church, we wanted the new structure to match. Now we have the new structure detached from the existing church and do not want to diminish or compete with the church in any way. The church is of strong form, with unique materials. With the new structure, we tried to complement the structure but not compete with it in any way. We use some of the forms but will not mimic the church. We are using a similar stone, sloped roof forms; both buildings will be re-done in the same roofing material. We are creating a new entry on the side of the church, and those materials will be similar to what is on the new building. We did not want a typical, stucco-faced, retail structure placed next to a church. The new building will be two stories high. The West Ridge Road entry level is 6,000 square feet and set up so that one tenant could come in; however, it has enough flexibility that, as time goes on, it could hold multiple tenants if required. From the rear entrance there is 3,000 square feet of space for a secondary tenant. The church can be worked with comfortably. It has been well-built and not changed a lot over the last 50 years.

Mr. Fisher: We will not act on the project this evening because it has not yet received approval for the variances from the BZA. We will discuss and make a recommendation to the BZA. Some substantial changes have been made to the site from what we have seen previously. The existing church is one of the 101 top historical sites within the town.

Mr. Copey: If you recall, this application was before us several months ago and has been on hold. The Greece Environmental Board (GEB) feels that the landscape plan is better than average. Town staff comments were minimal and related to sprinkler system requirements, handicap signage, and building address.

Mr. Gauthier: I discussed minor technical comments with the design engineer; he was agreeable to them, so there are no major issues. We are trying to enhance site drainage.

Ms. DiBella: I am Chairperson of the Historic Preservation Commission. The building elevation displayed looks much different from what was provided to me.

Mr. Fenity: Yes, it has changed.

Ms. DiBella: As stated at previous Planning Board and Zoning Board meetings, the Historic Preservation Commission is in support of this project. We believe it is vital for the Town to do everything in its power to ensure that the former church building be saved. While it no longer serves as a church and has undergone some changes over the years, the basic form and much of its historic design and materials are still intact. It is still recognizable as a religious building.

Built in 1875, the former St. John the Evangelist Church is a Gothic Revival-style building constructed of Medina sandstone with limestone trim. It is one of only two surviving masonry-constructed 19th-century churches in town, the other one being Our Mother of Sorrows. It is the ONLY church of stone construction that survives in Greece. It is architecturally significant because few rural churches were constructed with sandstone masonry in the 1800s.

The Commission commends the current owner/developer for his willingness to incorporate the historic church building into the redevelopment of this property. We also commend the architect for his (previous) design of the new building. [Since the developer provided a completely new design for the new building at the July 7 meeting, the Commission will need to review the new plans before commenting on this. As of right now, we are not happy with

PLANNING BOARD MINUTES

JULY 7, 2010

the new design.] Setting it back on the lot and keeping its roofline lower than the historic building shows respect for the older building.

In designing new buildings that will share the site of historic buildings, it is important not to merely duplicate or copy the existing building. Instead, it is better to incorporate some features of the old, but make it evident that the new building was constructed in the 21st century and not the 19th century. We believe the earlier design accomplished this better.

The Commission was glad to see in the updated plans that the developer chose to reduce the size of the new building. Adding space between the historic church building and new building further displays that the two buildings are from different time periods but are able to co-exist today.

One plan for the historic building's renovation does concern the Commission: the removal of the former church's belfry (bell tower), the small structure sticking out of the roof in the rear of the main building.

While it obviously doesn't have a purpose today, the Commission feels it is an important part of the building's history and should not be removed. So much has already been altered from the building's exterior, taking away from what made it a church, including the removal of the roof cresting, and all the stained glass windows, and the installation of the large plate glass windows on the front of the building. Here are photographs of the bell tower and earlier church design.

In doing research on the building, I came across some interesting stories about the belfry and the bell that once occupied its space. Apparently, one of St. John's original parishioners, Adam J. Volkmar, donated the bell, as well as a stained glass window, to the church in appreciation for surviving a shipwreck on his way to America in 1854. The bell that rang in the belfry was the same bell that once called lawyers to the Monroe County Courthouse in downtown Rochester almost 190 years ago.

The Commission strongly urges the Planning Board to not allow the removal of the belfry. If it is too badly deteriorated to repair, then we recommend that it be reconstructed. (Refer to photo of the church when the belfry was in better condition.) The previous design for the new building had a design element included which complemented the church belfry, but that appears to have been removed from the new design.

In regard to the design of the sign for this project, the Commission was impressed with the earlier design and how it reflected the historic building with the use of materials (stone and copper), the posts reflected the buttresses of the old church, and the pointed peaks which complemented both buildings. This is no longer true for the new building elevations. However, we are concerned about the size, massing and height of the structure and made comments about this to the BZA.

Here are some other comments, questions and/or requests the Commission has:

- What are the developer's plans for the windows, doors and interior of the historic building?
- Will the lower level entrance remain on the church building?
- What materials will be used for the roof of the new building and church building? What materials will be used for the roof of the new entry on the church building? (It looks different.)
- Would it be possible to supply a more detailed illustration of the new handicap access ramp associated with the new entry on the west elevation?

PLANNING BOARD MINUTES

JULY 7, 2010

- If there is a new handicap access ramp on the side, could the ramp on the front be removed?
- The Commission would like to have the opportunity to photograph the interior of the former church BEFORE any changes are made and also when any original materials are uncovered during renovations.
- If original interior materials are uncovered in the church building (woodwork, beams in the ceiling, and so forth), the Commission asks that they be retained in the renovation if at all possible.
- The Commission would like the developer to consider the possibility of an historic photo exhibit on display in the renovated church building and would be glad to assist with that.

The Commission feels that the successful completion of this project will send an important message to future developers in town, showing them that historic buildings and new buildings can successfully co-exist.

I'd like a chance to review the new design and comment on it.

Mr. Selke: You commented on the handicap ramp at the front entrance. I think it should be removed if possible as well. What do you see for the entrance? The bell tower is significant but in very bad shape and appears to be all boarded up.

Ms. DiBella: I don't think you should make any changes. You should keep as it was. The photo I shared is old but we do have one from the 1950s showing the addition of the front entrance. I keep hearing that the belfry is in bad shape; but if removed, I would miss it. It is a part the building that tells you it was a church. It doesn't have to function, I just want the appearance if possible.

Mr. Schultz: We can look into it.

Mr. Fenity: I'll address some of the architectural questions raised. I'd like to thank Gina as she has been very helpful as we have worked on this project. Our concern with the belfry is the condition and the fact that it can't easily be seen. It will come down to money. We will be happy provide and to work on details of the new design. It should be noted that these design changes have been tenant-driven and we need to work with them also to make this project go forward. The front entry will be removed, as it is unsightly and unsafe. Incorporating handicap ramps into 19th century structures is difficult because they can't be hidden. We will certainly take the one off the front and try to tie in the side ramp, hiding it as much as possible. The west side entry needs to tie into the new building, but also into the existing structure. The roof material for both buildings will be asphalt shingle. Our hope is to highlight the entryways with banding seam metal roof of a copper color, which ties to the Medina sandstone. The lower level, west side entrance will remain. We will certainly work with you to take photographs.

Bob Skrypek, 372 Buck Hill Road, St. John the Evangelist Parish Council: I am reviewing items discussed in December 2008. St. John the Evangelist Church supports having the old church be retained and is pleased with what has been done. The church is in support of the variances needed. Security is a concern as it relates to a retail building, the school, and church. We are in the process of looking at other uses for the property formerly used as the school. It is important to have a separation between the retail space and St. John the Evangelist Church. We do not want people cutting through, and it is used for that today. We are looking for a barrier between the properties so that there is clear definition as to parking, etc. for the two different properties. The former school has opportunities and we don't want a parking conflict between the two. We submitted to the Board a written desire to have light spillage onto our property. Drainage is a concern for us. Today the property

PLANNING BOARD MINUTES

JULY 7, 2010

has lost about 30% of its green space. The slope of the land leads the water onto St. John the Evangelist Church property. In recent years, we have had considerable flooding. I am a novice as to how water flows uphill and curves around a corner to Grecian Gardens apartments, but, I believe Mr. Schultz.

Mr. Fisher: Our drainage expert is here and will review the plans to be sure that it doesn't violate any of the laws of physics.

Mr. Skrypek: I have to believe you. We have actually upgraded some of our storm sewers, to make sure that the problem wasn't ours. The last concern that I have is trash disposal. Will it still remain in-house? Aesthetically, I support Gina DiBella's comments.

Mr. Selke: What are the variances required?

Mr. Schultz: Signage, parking spaces (59 required vs. 54 available), setback from West Ridge Road right-of-way, and distance of front and rear parking strips from property lines.

Mr. Selke: I'm concerned about snow storage; you have very limited space.

Mr. Schultz: If, in fact, snow storage gets beyond what is proposed, it will be moved off-site. We will use the new access installed on West Ridge Road. The front parking lot will be used by the tenant of the new building. Traffic will proceed through the two buildings to the rear parking lot, with an exit out at Grecian Gardens apartments. Traffic for both entrances onto West Ridge Road and Grecian Gardens will be right-in, right-out only. Because there is a median on West Ridge Road in front of our property, we only get westbound traffic in front of the site. We haven't looked at "Stop" signs yet, but will post as needed.

Mr. Selke: We would like samples of the proposed exterior materials for review prior to approval. What type of lighting will you be using?

Ms. Schultz: We will light the two entrances with typical posts. Off the rear exterior wall, the lighting will be elevated to spread the light. We will get the light spill that St. John the Evangelist Church wants by raising the elevation of the lights. The parking lot will be curbed and have a different elevation; to get to St. John the Evangelist Church, one would have to jump a curb.

Mr. Skrypek: We are surrounded by apartments and children. Today we have a problem with graffiti and skateboarding. It is used as a cut-through for bikes and pedestrians, and I have even seen cars go through the school and church building parking lots. We'd like every feasible barrier we can get in order to stop this.

Mr. Selke: Where will air conditioning units be located? What will be the landscaping?

Mr. Fenity: On the west side of the building, we will have four or five split air conditioning systems that are ground-mounted, similar to residential.

Mr. Schultz: I think that you will be impressed with the landscaping. We actually received comments from the BZA. It is included with the plans.

Mr. Fisher: You should provide some landscaping along the frontage. Scott Copey can provide some species that are robust but will not block visibility.

Mr. Fenity: There is a covered walkway with posts along the frontage of the new building. The new building takes up less footprint than the previous one, while retaining the same square footage.

Mr. Selke: I'd like to see more done to the rear of the building facing St. John the Evangelist Church.

Mr. Fenity: The tenants in the rear will want to see that as well.

PLANNING BOARD MINUTES

JULY 7, 2010

Mr. Fisher: One of our previous concerns was, how are you going to get from the rear of the site to the front? You have managed to provide a method there. Another thing was the proximity to West Ridge Road provided potential for a hazard with people exiting. Those concerns have been eliminated. Previous parking issues seem to have gone away with this new layout.

Motion by Ms. Plouffe, seconded by Mr. Selke:

WHEREAS, the Planning Board and the Applicant have worked together to modify the proposal in response to staff and Planning Board concerns regarding access and parking safety and the applicant has agreed to work with the Planning Board and Town staff regarding identifying traffic and handicap signage on the site.

NOW THEREFORE be it

RESOLVED that the Planning Board recommends the Board of Zoning Appeals approval of area variances requested.

VOTE:	Ancello	- absent	Burke	- yes
	Marianetti	- yes	Plouffe	- yes
	Selke	- yes	Sofia	- absent
			Fisher	- yes

MOTION CARRIED

RECOMMENDATION MADE

Motion by Ms. Plouffe, seconded by Mr. Selke, to continue the application to the July 21, 2010, meeting.

VOTE:	Ancello	- absent	Burke	- yes
	Marianetti	- yes	Plouffe	- yes
	Selke	- yes	Sofia	- absent
			Fisher	- yes

MOTION CARRIED

APPLICATION CONTINUED TO

JULY 21, 2010 MEETING

PLANNING BOARD MINUTES
JULY 7, 2010

New Business

1. Applicant: Sunshine Realty, Inc.

Location: 3100 Latta Road

Request: Site plan re-approval for a proposed addition (5,400+/- square feet) to an existing one-story professional office building, with related parking, utilities, grading, and landscaping on 0.88 acres

Zoning District: BR (Restricted Business)

Mon. Co. Tax No.: 045.03-2-9

The following is a synopsis of the discussion pertaining to the above-referenced request:

John Geisler, Sunshine Realty, presented the application.

Mr. Geisler: I am happy to be back after two-and-a-half years for re-approval of our building addition. We hope to move forward this year with your approval.

Mr. Copey: As noted, this was approved in 2008. The previous Planning Board site plan approval and the approval signatures on the site plan have expired, so this is just a re-approval. A few Town staff comments were received relative to regulation changes occurring over this time frame, requiring some modification to be in compliance. We will re-date the approval signatures on the original drawings to avoid confusion. Re-approval is based on the understanding that the basement indicated in a letter dated November 12, 2007 from the applicant, shall be only for storage and utilities. The storm water maintenance agreement was generated but never filed and now will have to be filed.

Mr. Geisler: Along with the application, we are looking for approval of our new sign and location.

Mr. Fisher: As an aside, this is another historic building.

Mr. Geisler: Yes, this is an 1860 schoolhouse. We are going to adapt the new building with similar roof lines, matching dormers, etc.

Motion by Mr. Selke, seconded by Mr. Marianetti:

WHEREAS, Sunshine Realty (the "Applicant") has submitted a proposal to the Town of Greece Planning Board (the "Planning Board") for re-approval of the site plan, as more fully described in the minutes of this public meeting (the "Proposal"), relative to property located at 3100 Latta Road (the "Premises"); and

WHEREAS, the Planning Board makes the following findings:

1. Upon review of the Proposal, the Planning Board determined that the Proposal is subject to the State Environmental Quality Review Act (New York State Environmental Conservation Law, Article 8) and its implementing regulations (6 NYCRR Part 617 *et seq.*, the "SEQRA Regulations") (collectively, "SEQRA"), and that the Proposal constitutes an Unlisted action under SEQRA.
2. The Planning Board has considered the Proposal at a public meeting (the "Meeting") in the Greece Town Hall, 1 Vince Tofany Boulevard, at which time all persons and organizations in interest were heard.

PLANNING BOARD MINUTES

JULY 7, 2010

3. Documentary, testimonial, and other evidence were presented at the Meeting relative to the Proposal for the Planning Board's consideration.
4. The Planning Board carefully has considered an Environmental Assessment Form and supplementary information prepared by the Applicant and the Applicant's representatives, including but not limited to supplemental maps, drawings, descriptions, analyses, reports, and reviews (collectively, the "Environmental Analysis").
5. The Planning Board carefully has considered additional information and comments that resulted from telephone conversations, meetings, or written correspondence from or with the Applicant and the Applicant's representatives.
6. The Planning Board carefully has considered information, recommendations, and comments that resulted from telephone conversations, meetings, or written correspondence from or with various involved and interested agencies, including but not limited to the Monroe County Department of Planning and Development, the Monroe County Department of Environmental Services, the Town of Greece Environmental Board, and the Town's own staff.
7. The Planning Board carefully has considered information, recommendations, and comments that resulted from telephone conversations, meetings, or written correspondence from or with nearby property owners, and all other comments submitted to the Planning Board as of this date.
8. The Environmental Analysis examined the relevant issues associated with the Proposal.
9. The Planning Board has met the procedural and substantive requirements of SEQRA.
10. The Planning Board carefully has considered each and every criterion for determining the potential significance of the Proposal upon the environment, as set forth in SEQRA.
11. The Planning Board carefully has considered (that is, has taken the required "hard look" at) the Proposal and the relevant environmental impacts, facts, and conclusions disclosed in the Environmental Analysis.
12. The Planning Board concurs with the information and conclusions contained in the Environmental Analysis.
13. The Planning Board has made a careful, independent review of the Proposal and the Planning Board's determination is rational and supported by substantial evidence, as set forth herein.
14. To the maximum extent practicable, potential adverse environmental effects revealed in the environmental review process will be minimized or avoided by the incorporation of mitigation measures that were identified as practicable.

NOW, THEREFORE, be it

RESOLVED that, pursuant to SEQRA, based on the aforementioned information, documentation, testimony, and findings, and after examining the relevant issues, the Planning Board's own initial concerns, and all relevant issues raised and recommendations offered by involved and interested agencies and the Town's own staff, the Planning Board determines that the Proposal will not have a significant adverse impact on the environment, which constitutes a negative declaration.

PLANNING BOARD MINUTES
JULY 7, 2010

VOTE:	Ancello	- absent	Burke	- yes
	Marianetti	- yes	Plouffe	- yes
	Selke	- yes	Sofia	- absent
			Fisher	- yes

MOTION CARRIED
SEQRA DETERMINATION
NEGATIVE DECLARATION

Mr. Selke then made the following motion, seconded by Mr. Marianetti, to re-approve the Proposal, subject to the following conditions:

1. The Applicant shall develop the Premises in conformity with all details of the Proposal as presented in the written descriptions and site development plans, as orally presented to the Planning Board, and as set forth herein. In the event of any conflict among the oral or written descriptions of the proposal, the site development plans of the proposal, or the requirements or restrictions of this resolution, the Applicant agrees that the Planning Board shall determine the resolution of said dispute.
2. All conditions of the June 20, 2007, site plan approval shall remain in full force and effect.
3. The site plan shall be updated to the satisfaction of the Town's Commissioner of Public Works, Chief Engineer, Fire Marshal, and Planning Board Clerk prior to re-dating their respective signatures.
4. Re-approval is granted with the understanding that the basement, as indicated in a letter from Applicant dated November 12, 2007, shall only be used for storage and building utilities.
5. Pursuant to the Town's Storm Water Management Law, adopted by the Town Board on December 18, 2007, the Storm Water Maintenance Agreement shall be filed in the Office of the Monroe County Clerk prior to final approval signatures.
6. Wherever this resolution refers to a specific applicant, developer, operator, or property owner, it shall be construed to include any heirs, successors, trustees, or assigns.
7. Wherever this resolution refers to a specific public official or agency, it shall be construed to include successors and assigns.
8. Wherever this resolution refers to a specific law, ordinance, code, rule, or regulation, it shall be construed to include any succeeding authority.

VOTE:	Ancello	- absent	Burke	- yes
	Marianetti	- yes	Plouffe	- yes
	Selke	- yes	Sofia	- absent
			Fisher	- yes

MOTION CARRIED
APPLICATION APPROVED
WITH CONDITIONS

PLANNING BOARD MINUTES
JULY 7, 2010

- 2. Applicant:** **Home Leasing, LLC**
- Location: 3027 – 3057 Latta Road
- Request: Site plan approval for Phase I of the proposed Gardens at Town Center apartments, a two- and three-story apartment building for senior citizens (98 dwelling units in Phase I; 176 total dwelling units, 61,250+/- square feet total), with related parking, utilities, grading, and landscaping on approximately 11.8 acres
- Zoning District: RMS (Multiple-Family Residential, Senior Citizen)
- Mon. Co. Tax No.: 045.03-45 and -6

The following is a synopsis of the discussion pertaining to the above-referenced request:

Jerry Goldman, Esq., Fix Spindleman Brovitz and Goldman; John Stapleton, Marathon Engineering; Dan Glasow, Glasow-Simmons Architecture; Stephanie Benson, Edgemere Development; and Charles Arena, Developer, presented the application.

Mr. Goldman: I am the attorney and agent for Home Leasing and their joint venture partner, Charles Arena. We are here for approval of Gardens at Town Center, to be located on the south side of Latta Road. As the Board may recall, this matter was before this board on a rezoning referral to rezone from Single-Family Residential (R1-12) to Multiple-Family Residential – Senior Citizen (RMS) to allow for this senior citizen housing development. That particular application went through scrutiny by the Town Board. The Town Board was the lead agency for the coordinated environmental review under the State Environmental Quality Review Act (SEQRA). There won't be need for SEQRA on this proposal because it has been completed. As part of the submission and presentation to Town Board, there was an environmental site analysis; traffic, market, wetland, archaeological, and visual analyses; and a tree assessment. The public hearing was held and the matter was considered over a period of months. During that time, a substantial amount of modifications were made. The Town Board ultimately made their SEQRA determination and granted rezoning to allow this affordable, senior housing project. One of the conditions of that approval was the applicant would submit a site plan to this board for review.

Mr. Stapleton: We have provided to the Board an overall color rendering of the site superimposed on aerial imagery. Our access point is about 900 feet east of the Latta Road-Long Pond Road intersection. To the north and west is residential property. To the south, we are bounded by Sawyer Park, a Town park. To the southeast is Round Pond Creek. To the east is residential development, being Willowood Drive. Our overall site is about 11.8 acres. It consists of two separate properties: 3027 Latta Road is just about an acres in size; and the remaining area at 3057 Latta Road is 10.7 acres. We have concentrated the development in the open, southern portion of the site. One of the challenges that we discussed with the Town Board was maintaining a parklike setting along Latta Road. We have approximately 250 feet of frontage along Latta Road, with one access point to our site. We have maintained landscaping and greenery all along this streetscape. This is our primary access and was included in a traffic study as part of the rezoning process. It was submitted to the New York State Department of Transportation (NYSDOT), which approved the access point. One of the conditions of rezoning was to secure access to the west and take advantage of the existing signalized access on Long Pond Road. We have been able to secure that with written agreements in place. The proposal is for 176 independent, senior citizen living units in two phases. The first phase is the western portion and contains 98 units with 86 one-bedroom units and 12 two-bedroom units. Phase 2 will be 78 units, with

PLANNING BOARD MINUTES
JULY 7, 2010

63 one-bedroom units and 15 two-bedroom units. The original concept plan that was presented at the time of the rezoning called for three stories. The Town Board felt that it was not appropriate for the northwest and northeast portions to be three stories; therefore, the Town Board reduced those parts to two stories as part of the rezoning requirements. As you enter the site, we provided a ring road around the entire building for access, as well as fire protection. The size of the access road was dictated by the Town's Fire Marshal. We have incorporated a porte-cochere at the main entrance to create a sense of arrival, as well as a pick-up/drop-off spot out of the elements. Typically for a project like this, we strive for a parking ratio of one parking space for each dwelling unit. It works in many projects around the area. For Phase 1, the 98 units we will have 100 parking spaces; and for Phase 2, the 78 units will have 80 parking spaces. We would do roadway and utility construction for the entire development, as well as fill and seed the future Phase 2 area, all as part of Phase 1. Phase 2 development could begin in 2013 or 2014 depending on how quickly Phase 1 is occupied. There is an existing trunk main sewer main along south property line, owned and maintained by Town of Greece. We will tap into that; it will handle our needs for full development. Water will come southward off Latta Road and access the building; backflow prevention will be provided, and the water line will completely loop around the building. Hydrants will be placed at all four corners, as required by the Fire Marshal. The storm drainage in the front area will be accomplished by open swales. Within those, we are proposing intermittent rain gardens. We have proposed storm water management facilities on the plan. As we get to pavement areas, they will be addressed with catch basins and underground piping facilities. There is a floodplain associated with Round Pond Creek that comes into our site; that floodplain is regulated by the Town. We need to address that with the Town's Engineering staff. Lighting will be shoebox fixtures so that light spillage can be controlled. We are proposing 18-foot-high poles with metal halide pulse start. Landscaping is generous for the site; we are saving as many trees as possible throughout the site. We will augment with additional plantings. Refuse will be held near the maintenance building in the southwest corner of the site. It will be enclosed according to Town requirements. The overall site is about 61% green space; the building occupies about 12% of the site.

Mr. Glasow: We have already completed many projects similar to this. Two locally are in Hilton and Gananda. We also have two under construction in Ogden and Farmington. Gananda is also three stories. I'm going to start with the general concept. The building has been designed for ease of access for residents and so they don't have to walk long distances to get to places. The ability to go to three stories assists with this. We will not be doing three stories throughout and I believe that helps with the massing of the building and eases into a more residential design. Green design is a hot term. This is not a LEED-certified project, but we are incorporating many green elements. Some of these are native plantings, rain gardens, water-conserving fixtures, a high-efficiency mechanical system for heating and cooling, minimal heat loss, compact florescent lighting, and roof-mounted solar panels. As shown on the floor plans, the square footage is the same for all units. Amenities include the covered drive-through/covered porch at the main entry, lounge, leasing center, public bathrooms, mail room, two elevators in Phase 1, laundry on each floor, trash recycling room on each floor, tenant storage on each floor (20 square feet for one-bedroom units and 25 square feet for two-bedroom units). There is a 1,758-square-foot community room with an adjacent residential-type kitchen. We have a wireless emergency call system, cable TV, intercom, Internet connection, and a large rear patio facing south. The individual unit layouts are shown. The entire complex is handicap accessible from the parking areas to the front door to the elevators and throughout each floor. We have Type A and B units, as mandated by the State. Type A is fully handicap-accessible with wheelchair shower, counters, and appropriate clearances; Type B units are handicap-adaptable units. Every unit has a balcony or patio. Here on the plan are the main and rear access points, and here are samples of the exterior materials. There will be colored stone at the main entry, vinyl

PLANNING BOARD MINUTES

JULY 7, 2010

siding, horizontal band, and cedar impressions in the gables which are vinyl but look like cedar shake. Colors will likely be earth tones with brown architectural asphalt shingles.

Mr. Goldman: This plan is a no variance plan. It fully conforms to the RMS zoning requirements. Development phasing starts on the west side, near the commercial development on Long Pond Road. There is no access to Willowood Drive from the project.

Mr. Selke: I'm concerned with this being done in two phases and the possibility of not being able to match colors.

Mr. Goldman: Because these are neutral colors, we do not see a problem with matching in the future.

Mr. Selke: We have encountered this problem in our town. You need to verify that there is a future for the materials when chosen.

Mr. Copey: The project has been reviewed by the Monroe County Department of Transportation (MCDOT); notably, they proposed access to Long Pond Road. The Greece Environmental Board noted that the Town's Tree Council should review the site and maintain as much buffer as possible. All other Town staff comments were standard and minimal. We are discussing how the Town's recreation trust fee will apply to this project. Today the fee is \$1250 per dwelling unit, and we are looking at the application of the fee to this site; a final determination has not been made. I spoke with David Goehring, Regional Traffic Engineer for New York State Department of Transportation (NYSDOT), Region 4, today regarding the installation of the traffic signal at Latta Road and West Bend Drive. The plans are finished, installation will be scheduled, and the traffic signal should be in place by the end of this year.

Mr. Gauthier: On June 28 we provided our comments. I believe that there are some detailed technical comments regarding drainage which have not yet been provided. The proposed filling operation into the stream corridor needs to be evaluated. There are no regulations to prohibit this; but I don't believe that the Town has done this in the last 10 years. The storage pond may have to get bigger.

Mr. Copey: In fairness to the developer, I did request that they hold off on any revisions to the plans until we obtained comments this evening. We did receive a letter dated June 30 from James Wasley of Willowood Drive expressing concerns over the demographics, environmental impact, traffic, etc.

Reynolds Allinger, 53 Parkside Lane: I have been aware of this project for a while and it is the wrong place at the wrong time. What is your definition of senior citizen housing?

Mr. Schiano: Chapter 211-14 of the Town Code states that each dwelling unit shall be occupied by at least one senior citizen (55 years or older). Children or grandchildren may reside with their parents or grandparents provided that at least one senior citizen resides in the dwelling unit; and said children or grandchildren are over the age of 19 years.

Mr. Allinger: That helps. This project is subsidized and it is misleading to call it senior housing. It should be renamed low-income housing. Who pays for it and how do they get the money?

Mr. Copey: It is senior citizen housing.

Mr. Fisher: I believe the process for funding is the applicant files an application to Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) and other sources to provide financing.

Mr. Allinger: The point I want to make is how much is this monstrosity going to cost?

PLANNING BOARD MINUTES

JULY 7, 2010

Mr. Fisher: We don't have control over the cost. We only have control over the design. The people providing the financing control the costs.

Mr. Schiano: They have organizations to work with the government to find financing.

Mr. Allinger: I never heard before tonight that the primary exit was going to be at Latta Road. I was told it was going to be on Long Pond Road and there would be a traffic light. That information came from people in the Town of Greece.

Mr. Fisher: The people who use the property will define the exit. Anyone wanting to go west, north, or south will use the Long Pond Road exit. Anyone wanting to go south on NYS Route 390 or east will use the Latta Road exit. The difficulty of left-hand turns onto Latta Road will discourage that method. I expect that the reason the Town Board insisted on access to the Long Pond Road traffic signal is because it will be the easiest, fastest, and safest way to go in those directions.

Mr. Allinger: The residents of Willowood Drive are going to be impacted by this. In the wintertime, it is a real concern due to residents taking their children to Athena Middle School/High School in the morning. I love Sawyer Park and it will be impacted by this development. There are blue crabs in the creek; we have salmon and brown trout when the creek runs. What will happen to that? I also have a concern about a building of that size.

Richard Miller, 208 Willowood Drive: I have a couple of concerns and then I'll turn the floor over to Jim Wasley. I have seen the traffic analysis. It appears to analyze the Latta Road-Long Pond Road traffic and then the traffic leaving this new development. It does not look at the traffic at Latta Road-Willowood Drive at all. I suggest that you look at that. It is very difficult to pull out and with this additional traffic, it will make it worse. The analysis shows the level of service at the Latta Road-Long Pond Road intersection being a "D," "F" being the worst. I don't know what it will go to with this added traffic; the same thing with the new exit. The report says it will be a "C" or "D." I don't think that we want senior citizens pulling out into "C" or "D" traffic. I don't know if this is an issue or not because I don't understand the Monroe County Water Authority, but what impact would this have on our annual water main break?

James Wasley, 137 Willowood Drive: I submitted the letter mentioned earlier in all respect to the architect and developer because a lot of work goes into this. However, it is not in their back yard. My comments are sincere and personal because it affects me and my neighbors as well as the cornerstone of Greece, Latta Road and Long Pond Road. The presentation was thorough and interesting. Is there anyone from Unity Health here? I'm surprised they don't have a representative present for us to pose questions to. I can't believe we are going to fill 176 units with residents 55 and older who aren't going to work every day and don't have children in school. Subsidized housing scares everyone. People who take no ownership and don't pay taxes are a concern. The project time line says we are going to have construction for many years. I've been in the business for 25 years, and you aren't going to find materials to match when you move to Phase 2. Environmental impact is a concern taking up 8 of the 11 acres with vinyl, subsidized housing. It isn't what I want to see next to Sawyer Park. What about the heating and cooling units? Where will the chillers be? That will blast us out of the neighborhood. Noise impact is huge. I have worked with SRF Associates, the project's traffic consultant, in the past, but with residents as young as 55 years old living here, I believe that the statistics should be different. I was disappointed to hear that some parts of the building would be three stories. I thought we were going to get away from that. Those trees won't camouflage a three story building. I don't want to stereotype low-income people but this is something I don't want in my back yard. I know the Town Board has done their due diligence and I'm asking, and am confident, you will do your job.

PLANNING BOARD MINUTES

JULY 7, 2010

Mr. Selke: We want to hear from the applicant. We don't know the rent fees, what kind of subsidy will be had. We have to give them a chance to explain those parts.

Mr. Wasley: I appreciate that and I like to work with facts. I just want to spark some thoughts for you. I encourage you to contact me.

Laurie Hopkins, 30 Parkside Lane: I don't agree with rezoning of the land. The area is a park with a stream, meadow, forest, and wildlife. It provides quality of life to Greece residents. The development will ruin this. It provides balance to the commercial area. There is other land available for this type of development; for example, across from the Post Office on Latta Road or near the Town Hall. A three-story building is like an urban area. It will negatively impact the area. Please have a revolt on this development.

Steven Cottom, 2895 Latta Road: I live at the corner of Willowood Drive and Latta Road. The subsidy issue is very important. I have firsthand knowledge. My mother lives in Brockport at Wellington Woods. That is a senior citizen, subsidized development. It started out very nice. About five years ago, due to the federal funding provided, provisions needed to be made for handicap residents. Along with that, the town needed to provide a lot more services such as fire, ambulance. Then the government says, federally subsidized, you have to take in mentally ill. We now have mentally ill and drug addicts in what was to be senior complex. It will start out nice and become a security issue and burden to the Town. There was just a situation at Wellington Woods where a resident was arrested for robbing a bank; and at the same time, leaving her young daughter home alone.

Ronald and Margaret Call, 3025 Latta Road: We have the most property adjoining this development of anyone in this room. Some of our concerns have been addressed. You can't trust developers. At Town Board meetings, Mr. Arena said the two houses on the Latta Road properties he purchased would be demolished. Both of those houses are still there. One of the residences has been repainted and two families have moved in. The house adjacent to ours remains occupied by the previous owner and hasn't had repairs in 10 years. I will share photographs I have taken of the property. I think what has happened is Mr. Arena wants some quick income and is turning them into lease property. Latta Road is becoming rental property. We have photos of drainage in our neighbor's yard and we don't want it coming into our yard. I'm concerned that this is going to be another one of those problem housing projects in Greece.

Richard Dibble, 122 Willowood Drive: I agree with everything stated by my neighbors. This area is a slice of Greece that is set off by itself. I walk to Sawyer Park every day. It is not a bad project. The problem is where it is being located. It needs to be located where it is more open. I encourage this board to go out and look at some of the other developments they currently manage.

Robert Hopkins, 30 Parkside Lane: I'm from Brooklyn, New York. For years, I walked for miles to see two trees together. I know what happens to a place that becomes urban. I say put it on the other side of the road so they can go to Wegmans, Town Hall, the library. It ruins the quality of life for us and those using the park. How will security in the park be managed with the development right next door?

Christopher Pignone, 232 Willowood Drive: It was been stated that there won't be any access from the complex into Willowood Drive. Currently there is a sidewalk from Willowood Drive into Sawyer Park. Do you plan to put a fence around it? The building reminds me a lot of First Bible Baptist Church and I think that's for sale.

Mr. Goldman: Thank you for all your comments. The project will be developed in accordance with the Town zoning ordinance for senior citizen housing. We are looking at 12 two-bedroom units and 86 one-bedroom units at the site. Monthly rents for a one-bedroom unit will be \$600 to \$925 and for two-bedroom units, \$747 to \$925. This is not subsidized

PLANNING BOARD MINUTES

JULY 7, 2010

housing in the sense of a check coming from the federal government to the landlord to supplement a person's monthly rent. The way this is made affordable is through financing methods provided by the State. One is a tax credit program and also a housing authority subsidy for project development costs. These credits allow rents to be lower. The traffic discussion is a good one. The study does focus on our access sites. Most exits will be out at the signalized Long Pond Road exit. The Latta Road exit will be used mainly for right turns only onto Latta Road. Today, we looked at a couple of projects, and despite the age requirement being 55 and older, the average age was significantly older. At College Green in North Chili, the average age was 75 to 80; in Gananda, the average age was 73; in Tonawanda, the average age was 75 ½. People at the age of 55 don't generally want to live with people of that age. We can provide building dimensions to the Board. The traffic review for this project did not require an analysis of Willowood Drive. It is not anticipated to increase traffic at peak hours due to the age of the residents. The construction periods will be done as quickly as possible. I'll have the architect speak to the air conditioning.

Mr. Glasow: It is a combined heating and cooling system. The very small unit is located in the mechanical rooms and combines the condenser with the heating unit. We will not have a big chiller. Individual furnaces will be located in the common areas, and coolers will have small condensers in the rear of the building with landscaping around them. There will be a small number of them and they will not generate a lot of noise. We have a cut sheet on the unit which we can provide.

Mr. Goldman: I am not familiar with Wellington Woods. You will find an evolution to all projects. There is no federal money being spent here, so you will not see that type of change in residents here.

Mr. Schiano: Are we talking money for construction or money for the tenants paying rent?

Stephanie Benson, Edgemere Development, 100 Andrews Street: At this point, there are no rent subsidies for this project. There is subsidy for capital costs of construction of the building; federal tax credits come through the State. The State regulates the project by income and age of the residents. This project is bound by a regulatory agreement for 30 years and it is recorded with the deed at completion of construction. The funding uses tax-exempt bonds and tax credits; requirements have to be followed in order to get the money.

Mr. Selke: The rent prices alone will not allow just anybody into this project. These are middle-of-the-road rents. Low-income housing places like Ada Ridge, Park Ridge Commons, and Rush Commons have rentals at \$350 per month. We also have other senior housing with rentals of up to \$1200 to \$1500 per month. I expect that a lot of widows will come here. There is a demand for this housing.

Ms. Benson: Monthly rents for a one-bedroom unit will be \$623 to \$775; two-bedroom units will be \$747 to \$925. The area median income is \$66,600 for a family of four. This housing targets incomes of \$23,350 to \$47,952 for a two-person household.

Mr. Goldman: There are controls in place to manage this project. It is zoned for senior citizen housing. Also, most units are one-bedroom, which targets that age group.

Mr. Gauthier: The drainage issues will be addressed. When the developer has completed the project, the drainage will not be any worse, and in fact, often is improved due to drainage regulations.

Mr. Goldman: We will provide addresses for you to visit other sites.

Mr. Selke: Who will be the property manager?

Ms. Benson: Home Leasing is a joint venture with Mr. Arena. The Chairman of Home Leasing is the Chief Operating Officer (COO) of Home Properties and now co-chairman of

PLANNING BOARD MINUTES

JULY 7, 2010

the board. He has 40 years of experience in managing properties. He will be the property manager with Unity Health to provide services as tenants need them.

Mr. Selke: Have you done any local surveys to see what the senior population is?

Ms. Benson: The Town requested an overall market study of Greece as part of this project. We found that there was a need of over 627 affordable apartments for the town. In order to obtain our financing through the State, we have to obtain a third-party market study. They define the study and it was found we have a 2.86% capture rate, which means that for every 100 income- and age-eligible people in need of housing, this project will provide only 3 units. They believe that there are 1200 to 1500 people in this area in need of this type of housing.

Mr. Selke: Are these roads private or dedicated? Will there be sidewalks?

Mr. Stapleton: The roads are private and sidewalks are not proposed at this time along the access roads. There will, however, be sidewalks that loop the building. We are also looking at providing a trail.

Mr. Selke: The residents are going to want sidewalks. They will walk to the YMCA, to Wegmans, and to the Town Hall campus. It is important that you consider this. You mentioned the time frame for Phase 1 as three years.

Ms. Benson: We are planning to submit the application in the next couple of weeks or a month. It usually takes about a year to secure financing – 2011; a year for construction – 2012; and full occupancy – 2013. At that point, we will need another full market study to show that our building is full and that there still is a need for the construction of Phase 2 – 2014; secure financing – 2015; construction – 2016; and fully occupied – 2017.

Mr. Selke: You are offering the necessary amenities to draw senior citizens, things such as a community center, outdoor patio, and security. How many building entrances are there and what will the security be? What parking provisions are made for visitors?

Ms. Benson: To enter, they will have a card or a security code to punch in. Visitors will be allowed in via an intercom system.

Mr. Stapleton: We haven't specifically designated parking for visitors. We have gone to other projects of this type and a parking ratio of one parking space per dwelling unit seems appropriate.

Ms. Benson: Monroe County did a study on parking and found that a 1:1 ratio was more than enough. They found that 50% of the parking spaces were vacant at all times in these developments.

Mr. Selke: How do you plan to have transportation for all these senior citizens who won't have cars?

Ms. Benson: Home Leasing is looking at purchasing a van and Unity Health provides some of those services.

Mr. Copey: Do you have other senior citizen facilities that service this income level?

Ms. Benson: We have a non-senior facility on Main Street in Rochester with parking. Every time we do a project, we look at this and ask the questions.

Mr. Fisher: Parking during holidays may be an issue. The area is isolated and you don't want parking on the roads. If you can take a look at similar places, it would be helpful.

Mr. Goldman: We will take a look at that.

PLANNING BOARD MINUTES

JULY 7, 2010

Mr. Glasow: Visitors will come in a main entrance. There is a secure vestibule with a list of all the residents. There is an intercom system where the visitors will call and be buzzed in to enter. We have multiple tenant access points so that they can enter closest to their unit.

Mr. Stapleton: To follow up on parking, in Phase 1, for 98 units we have designated 100 parking spaces. The southern parking lot will be brought to binder, allowing 20 additional spaces. Also, the east half of the southern parking lot was to be used for construction staging, but could be used for additional parking. During Phase 2 there is an opportunity to increase parking. We failed to mention that the project will include one-half acre in the southeast corner for a vegetable/flower garden for the residents. There will be a small tool shed and greenhouse.

Mr. Selke: Will you allow pets?

Ms. Benson: They are allowed. There is a pet policy attached to the lease. They have to have their shots, etc.

Mr. Selke: Make sure that there are crosswalks and signage for traffic. What about trash?

Mr. Glasow: We have trash recycling rooms on each floor. Tenants will dispose of their trash there and maintenance will remove on trash days.

Ms. Benson: I believe that staff will include maintenance and part-time rental person. They will be charged with trash removal on appropriate days.

Mr. Fisher: When will the Long Pond Road access be available?

Mr. Stapleton: that will be done with Phase 1. The road has to be in prior to the Town issuing the certificate of occupancy for the building.

Mr. Fisher: Will there be backup power?

Mr. Stapleton: There are generators that will target the life safety issues.

Mr. Glasow: Don't forget that we will have solar panels on the roof, so we will generate our own electricity.

Eileen Kissel, 200 Willowood Drive: I want this development placed in a more open area. There are several spots farther down Long Pond Road. There is space next to Rockcastle Florist and across Latta Road from the Post Office.

Mr. Schiano: The property has been rezoned and it is their property. Picking the location is not in our realm. They can develop it according to code.

Ms. Kissel: What if the residents of Willowood Drive came up with the money, purchased the property, and donated it to Sawyer Park?

Mr. Copey: This property was of interest to the Town as an addition to the park; however, the seller was not interested in selling to the Town at the appraised value. Based on our Master Plan, it met the needs for senior housing and transition of use.

Mr. Miller: I might have been lighthearted on the water main breaks, but that really needs to be studied.

Eric Ambrose, 22 Parkside Lane: Two other developments have been cited, both significantly smaller than this. I'd like to know the size of the property they are on. I think this concentration is severe. This appears to be a recipe for something not good.

Chris Quinlan, 347 Willowood Drive: I hope to offer a different perspective. I am new to the community and moved here because of the area. I am a small business owner, so I understand the business side of it. For me listening, I saw a lot of risk. If you want to motivate people to leave, this will be one way to do it.

PLANNING BOARD MINUTES

JULY 7, 2010

Motion by Ms. Burke, seconded by Mr. Marianetti, to continue the application to the August 4, 2010, meeting.

VOTE:	Ancello	- absent	Burke	- yes
	Marianetti	- yes	Plouffe	- yes
	Selke	- yes	Sofia	- absent
			Fisher	- yes

MOTION CARRIED
APPLICATION CONTINUED TO
AUGUST 4, 2010, MEETING

PLANNING BOARD MINUTES
JULY 7, 2010

3. Applicant: Route 390 Nissan, LLC, d.b.a. Ideal Nissan

Location: 4012, 4026, 4036 West Ridge Road

Request: Site plan approval for a proposed automotive sales and leasing dealership (13,496+/- square feet), with related parking, utilities, grading, and landscaping on approximately 2.07 acres

Zoning District: BG (General Business)

Mon. Co. Tax No.: 073.01-2-28, -29, -30

The following is a synopsis of the discussion pertaining to the above-referenced request:

Betsy Brugg, Esq., Fix Spindleman, Brovitz and Goldman; Leonard Preston, Costich Engineering; Angelo Ingrassia, Owner and Operator; and Jay Harris Maxwell, Hanlon Architects, presented the application.

Ms. Brugg: We are here for site plan approval. This is the first time before this board; however, the project has been underway since 2008. We received rezoning approval for this property in June of this year. Last night, we appeared before the Board of Zoning Appeals (BZA), where we obtained approval for a special use permit to operate and variances for the signage. There are no variances needed for our site plan. We have attended Development Review Committee meetings with the Town and have addressed many issues early on. We are talking about three parcels on the north side of West Ridge Road, sandwiched between the Kohl's and Fuccillo Kia Automotive. The area has Larkin Creek on its east side, Kohl's and the DiMarco Group's office building are in the rear, and there are several other car dealerships in the area. With respect to the site, there currently are two houses and a vacant lot; two existing curb cuts will be consolidated. This has been presented to the New York State Department of Transportation (NYSDOT) which has responded favorably to combining the two curb cuts. Being a car dealership, the traffic is relatively low. We estimate 20 employees for the operation, who will be split up among the various functions within the dealership. The sales showroom is in front, there is a small mezzanine area, and a drop-off area for service. The look is contemporary and fits with Nissan's new look. Hours of operation will be 7:30 a.m. to 8:00 p.m. Mondays through Thursdays, and 7:30 a.m. to 5:00 p.m. Fridays and Saturdays. They will provide sales and service, with the service located in the rear. There will be no body work done at this location. The elevations have been modified per discussions with Town staff. Nissan does require a certain type of building, but we have tried to meet your needs within their parameters. The rear of the building is operational only.

Mr. Fisher: Because you see the rear of the building from Kohl's, we feel that it needs to be treated as a four-sided building. It needs interest in the rear as well as the front. The items suggested, and modifications made, have added character.

Ms. Brugg: We have added screening in one area to avoid headlights from our site hitting North Greece Road. There is one entrance into the site. Plans for snow storage go hand-in-hand with seasonal sales of cars. In the winter, there isn't the need to store as much inventory, so empty spaces will be used for snow storage. There is some flexibility in the Town zoning ordinance for parking requirements for dealerships. We will remove snow if necessary.

Mr. Selke: When the snow melts, where will it go?

Mr. Preston: We have storm inlets near where the snow will be stored and pavement will drain in that direction.

PLANNING BOARD MINUTES

JULY 7, 2010

Ms. Brugg: Delivery is generally once a day. They enter the site, go around the rear of the building, and drop off inventory.

Mr. Copey: Plans were submitted to the Monroe County Development Review Committee (MCDRC); we received minimal comments. Greece Environmental Board reviewed and suggested that landscaping be added to the north retaining wall area. Town staff had all standard comments.

Mr. Gauthier: We have had a series of meetings on this project and you have been responsive. The adjoining drainage easement is being reviewed by the Town Attorney. There was concern over encroachment on the property during development.

Mr. Selke: How do the cars enter for service?

Ms. Brugg: You drive straight into the site, you park your car under the canopy near the west side of the building, leave your car, and enter the building. Service staff will take your car around the rear of the building to be serviced. There are two rear doors: one for service; another for wash. The cars will be brought around front.

Mr. Selke: How will you manage trash?

Mr. Ingrassia: We have a company that picks up all the old filters and oil. It is stored inside and picked up once a day. Tires are recycled by a company that picks them up. The only thing we have in dumpsters is paper and corrugated box material.

Mr. Hanlon: The dumpster enclosure is 18 feet x 12 feet split-face block to match the retaining wall there. The front doors will be steel posts with stockade board fence to a height of 8 feet.

Mr. Selke: What about landscaping?

Mr. Hanlon: On the west side of the building between service drop-off entrance and exit, we will add landscaping.

Mr. Fisher: Because it is so much higher, you may not be able to see much at ground level.

Mr. Selke: There is a real concern about car dealership and display of cars out front.

Ms. Brugg: We are sensitive to that. We have 20 feet of landscape area out front. We have provided the green space that we can provide.

Mr. Ingrassia: It is not our practice to display cars on the front landscaped area.

Motion by Ms. Plouffe, seconded by Mr. Selke:

WHEREAS, Route 390 Nissan, LLC, d.b.a. Ideal Nissan (the "Applicant") has submitted a proposal to the Town of Greece Planning Board (the "Planning Board") for approval of a site plan, as more fully described in the minutes of this public meeting (the "Proposal"), relative to property located at 4012, 4026, and 4036 West Ridge Road (the "Premises"); and

WHEREAS, the Planning Board makes the following findings:

1. Upon review of the Proposal, the Planning Board determined that the Proposal is subject to the State Environmental Quality Review Act (New York State Environmental Conservation Law, Article 8) and its implementing regulations (6 NYCRR Part 617 *et seq.*, the "SEQRA Regulations") (collectively, "SEQRA"), and that the Proposal constitutes an Unlisted action under SEQRA.

PLANNING BOARD MINUTES

JULY 7, 2010

2. The Planning Board has considered the Proposal at a public meeting (the "Meeting") in the Greece Town Hall, 1 Vince Tofany Boulevard, at which time all persons and organizations in interest were heard.
3. Documentary, testimonial, and other evidence were presented at the Meeting relative to the Proposal for the Planning Board's consideration.
4. The Planning Board carefully has considered an Environmental Assessment Form and supplementary information prepared by the Applicant and the Applicant's representatives, including but not limited to supplemental maps, drawings, descriptions, analyses, reports, and reviews (collectively, the "Environmental Analysis").
5. The Planning Board carefully has considered additional information and comments that resulted from telephone conversations, meetings, or written correspondence from or with the Applicant and the Applicant's representatives.
6. The Planning Board carefully has considered information, recommendations, and comments that resulted from telephone conversations, meetings, or written correspondence from or with various involved and interested agencies, including but not limited to the Monroe County Department of Planning and Development, the Monroe County Department of Environmental Services, the Town of Greece Environmental Board, and the Town's own staff.
7. The Planning Board carefully has considered information, recommendations, and comments that resulted from telephone conversations, meetings, or written correspondence from or with nearby property owners, and all other comments submitted to the Planning Board as of this date.
8. The Environmental Analysis examined the relevant issues associated with the Proposal.
9. The Planning Board has met the procedural and substantive requirements of SEQRA.
10. The Planning Board carefully has considered each and every criterion for determining the potential significance of the Proposal upon the environment, as set forth in SEQRA.
11. The Planning Board carefully has considered (that is, has taken the required "hard look" at) the Proposal and the relevant environmental impacts, facts, and conclusions disclosed in the Environmental Analysis.
12. The Planning Board concurs with the information and conclusions contained in the Environmental Analysis.
13. The Planning Board has made a careful, independent review of the Proposal and the Planning Board's determination is rational and supported by substantial evidence, as set forth herein.
14. To the maximum extent practicable, potential adverse environmental effects revealed in the environmental review process will be minimized or avoided by the incorporation of mitigation measures that were identified as practicable.

NOW, THEREFORE, be it

RESOLVED that, pursuant to SEQRA, based on the aforementioned information, documentation, testimony, and findings, and after examining the relevant issues, the Planning Board's own initial concerns, and all relevant issues raised and recommendations offered by involved and interested agencies and the Town's own staff, the Planning Board

PLANNING BOARD MINUTES
JULY 7, 2010

determines that the Proposal will not have a significant adverse impact on the environment, which constitutes a negative declaration.

VOTE:	Ancello	- absent	Burke	- yes
	Marianetti	- yes	Plouffe	- yes
	Selke	- yes	Sofia	- absent
			Fisher	- yes

MOTION CARRIED
SEQRA DETERMINATION
NEGATIVE DECLARATION

Ms. Plouffe then made the following motion, seconded by Ms. Selke, to approve the Proposal, subject to the following conditions:

1. The Applicant shall develop the Premises in conformity with all details of the Proposal as presented in the written descriptions and site development plans, as orally presented to the Planning Board, and as set forth herein. In the event of any conflict among the oral or written descriptions of the proposal, the site development plans of the proposal, or the requirements or restrictions of this resolution, the Applicant agrees that the Planning Board shall determine the resolution of such dispute.
2. A dated signature of the owner/developer shall be added to the plan.
3. The August 28, 2008,, Federal Emergency Management Agency flood zone and map source for the Premises shall be added to the site plan. In addition, the boundaries (if any) and boundary designations shall be added to the plan.
4. A 5-foot-wide concrete sidewalk shall be provided constructed along the West Ridge Road frontage of the Premises. If the Town Board grants a waiver of the sidewalk requirement, the date of such waiver shall be added to the plan.
5. The landscaping on the Premises shall be maintained by the current owner of the Premises, and by any future owner. The owner of the Premises shall replace any dead plants with the same species or a similar species. The replacement plant shall be no smaller than the previous plant when it originally was installed. A note that indicates these requirements shall be added to the plan.
6. Prior to the issuance of a Final Certificate of Occupancy for the Premises, The Applicant shall provide certification verifying proper installation of landscape areas on the site in accordance with the landscape plan approved by the Planning Board, and in accordance with the Town's Landscape Guidelines for Development. Such certification shall be on the certification form provided in such guidelines and shall be completed by a [New York State Licensed Landscape Architect or Certified Nursery Professional]. A note that indicates these requirements shall be added to the plan.
7. All heating, ventilation, and air conditioning (HVAC) equipment shall be screened from public view. If the HVAC equipment is or will be roof-mounted, the screening for such HVAC equipment shall be visually compatible with the proposed building(s), and shall be shown on the architectural elevations of the building(s). If the HVAC equipment is or will be ground-mounted, its location shall be shown on the site plan. Evidence that such HVAC equipment is or will be screened shall be submitted for

PLANNING BOARD MINUTES

JULY 7, 2010

review and approval by the Clerk of the Planning Board prior to affixing the Planning Board approval signature to the site plan.

8. The exterior appearance (that is, materials, colors, and architectural style) of the proposed building shall be generally the same on all sides of the proposed building. As offered and agreed by the Applicant, such materials and colors shall be metal panel (in the gray/silver color family) with tinted windows to provide contrast. Exterior man doors and overhead doors shall be painted to match the siding. Elevations of the exterior appearance shall identify these colors and materials, shall show all sides of the proposed building, and shall be filed with the site plan.
9. Light spill shall be contained on the Premises. Outdoor light sources shall be aimed or shielded so that they are not visible when viewed from off the Premises, and so that light spill is cast only downward onto the Premises. Exempt from this requirement are low-wattage or low-voltage lights that are located near the principal entrance to a building, and low-wattage or low-voltage lights, not higher than 42 inches above grade, that define a walkway or other access to a building. A note that indicates this requirement shall be added to the plan.
10. Snow storage areas shall be identified on the plan.
11. The rezoning that was approved by the Town Board and the date on which such rezoning was approved shall be added to the plan.
12. No building permits shall be issued unless and until a digital copy of the plans has been submitted. All sheets in the drawing set, with all necessary signatures, shall be provided in Tagged Image File (".TIF") format at a minimum resolution of 400 dpi.
13. The locations of the designated fire lanes shall be shown on the Site Plan.
14. The locations of all exterior doors shall be shown on the plan. All exterior doors shall be connected by a sidewalk to an acceptable fire safety zone.
15. Permanently mounted "No Parking – Fire Lane" signs shall be posted along the fire lanes at intervals of 50 feet or less. A note that indicates this requirement shall be added to the plan.
16. The Applicant shall provide improvements within the Town's drainage easement located immediately to the east of the Premises, as directed by the Commissioner of Public Works, in order to accommodate storm water discharge from the proposed development.
17. Upon completion of construction of the storm water management facility, the Applicant shall provide certification that such facility was constructed as designed and approved. Such certification shall be provided by an appropriate New York State Licensed Professional.
18. No building permits shall be issued unless and until the Applicant executes an agreement for maintenance of the proposed storm water management pond. Such agreement shall be subject to approval by the Planning Board's Attorney and the Commissioner of Public Works.
19. No final approval signature shall be placed on the plans unless and until the appropriate easement and/or legal documents have been prepared and provided to the Town for review.
20. Subject to approval by the Town's Fire Marshal, Chief Engineer, and Commissioner of Public Works.

PLANNING BOARD MINUTES

JULY 7, 2010

21. Wherever this resolution refers to a specific applicant, developer, operator, or property owner, it shall be construed to include any successors and assigns.
22. Wherever this resolution refers to a specific public official or agency, it shall be construed to include successors and assigns.
23. Wherever this resolution refers to a specific law, ordinance, code, rule, or regulation, it shall be construed to include any succeeding or superseding authority.
24. Subject to approval and filing of an administrative Change of Lot Line Application combining tax parcels on the site.

VOTE:	Ancello	- yes	Burke	- yes
	Marianetti	- yes	Plouffe	- yes
	Selke	- yes	Sofia	- absent
			Fisher	- yes

MOTION CARRIED
APPLICATION APPROVED
WITH CONDITIONS

PLANNING BOARD MINUTES
JULY 7, 2010

ADJOURNMENT: 11:00 p.m.

APPROVAL OF PLANNING BOARD MEETING MINUTES

The Planning Board of the Town of Greece, in the County of Monroe and State of New York, rendered the above decisions.

Signed: _____
Chairman

Date: _____